COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY)
WINCHES FARM,
395, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS

VOLUME 10. Part 15
Pp. 459—513

24th July 1953

29.8.53.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Documents relating to Cases 64 to 70 prepared for consideration at Copenhagen, July-August 1953

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1953

Price One Pound, Five Shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 10, Part 15 (pp. 459-513) 24th July 1953

PART 3

PROPOSALS FOR BROADENING THE BASIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, FOR THE FURTHER REGULATION OF THE RULES RELATING TO ITS COMPOSITION, THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS AND THEIR TERM OF SERVICE, AND FOR THE ELABORATION OF THE PROCEDURE OF THAT BODY

CASE NO. 64

PROPOSAL FOR BROADENING THE BASIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)57)

DOCUMENT 64/1

By the **AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PARASITOLOGISTS**

Letter dated 30th October, 1952, from Dr. A. C. WALTON,
Secretary to the above Society

As Secretary of the American Society of Parasitologists, I am forwarding a number of enclosures for your study. These are the result of a study carried out by a special committee of our organization and the results as stated in the accompanying letters were authorized by the Society at its annual meeting held this last September.

Accordingly the letters * have been drawn up and after receiving the final review by the Council of the Society are being forwarded to you as Secretary and also to the other members of the Committee as named at the beginning of the major enclosure ϕ.

Enclosure to Dr. Walton's letter of 30th October, 1952

September 6, 1952

Comité International Permanent des Congrès de Zoologie : M. CAULLERY, Paris, *President* ; L. FAGE, Paris, *Secretaire-Général* ; F. BALTZER, Berne ; H. BOSCHMA, Leiden ; A. GHIGI, Bologne ; E. HINDLE, Londres ; S. HÖRSTADIUS, Upsala ; A. R. JORGE, Lisbonne, A. KÜHN, Göttingen ; E. N. PAVLOVSKY, Moscou ; G. G. SIMPSON, New York ; R. SPÄRCK, Copenhague ; V. van STRAELEN, Bruxelles ; E. WITSCHI, Iowa City.

---

* The other letters here referred to have been published elsewhere in the present volume.
ϕ The document termed by Dr. Walton as the " major enclosure " is that reproduced above.

Gentlemen :

The American Society of Parasitologists and its individual members are interested in achieving uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature through international co-operation of the type provided by the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. A committee was appointed at the annual meeting of the Society in November of 1951 to study the controversy that followed the announcement that " far-reaching decisions in regard to zoological nomenclature (had been) taken by the Thirteenth International Congress " [1]. The Committee was instructed to report its findings and recommendations to the American Society of Parasitologists at its annual meeting in September of 1952.

The committee found that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, as evidenced by the reports of its Secretary, was actively and energetically carrying out the responsibilities of its office. The Society wishes to express its gratitude for these efforts. However, as the Secretary of the Commission warned, "Any organisation must lose part of its moral authority if its membership cannot be effectively called in question by the general electorate to which it is nominally responsible ".[2] The Committee found that the critics of the Commission felt that the Commission had in fact lost some of its " moral authority " since they objected more strongly to its procedures than to many of its decisions. The American Society of Parasitologists is most anxious that the International Commission and the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature shall enjoy complete authority in nomenclatorial matters among all zoologists.

The International Commission and consequently the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature for many years maintained their authority because the Commission moved slowly and acted only after wide discussion of the problems involved. Furthermore, the Commission's voting procedure, including in some cases what amounted to a right of veto for any Commissioner, assured that good agreement was obtained before any action was taken. While this ponderous procedure assured careful (but not always infallible) actions, it was so inefficient that the work of the Commission was hampered to the extent that it could not handle the volume of work required of it. Much criticism was directed at the Commission because of its slowness in coming to decisions. In order to correct this, the Commission in Paris suspended its By-Laws, as it had done before at Lisbon, and approved new and more efficient procedures. The new system of voting adopted really amounts to a vote of confidence in the Secretary as well as a vote on the issues involved since conditional votes and affirmative votes are counted as affirmative while only negative votes are counted as negative. This and other modifications of procedure will undoubtedly speed the work of the Commission but they will also restrict its " moral authority ".

---

[1] *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 154.
[2] *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 9.

The American Society of Parasitologists agrees with the Secretary of the Commission that the most effective manner for achieving more authority is to broaden the basis of the authority. At its Paris meeting in 1948 the Commission moved to broaden the basis of its authority by revising the methods by which Commissioners were nominated and by increasing the number of Commissioners. According to their plan nominations for election to the office of Commissioner might be made by learned societies or other qualified institutions. Election to the office of Commissioner was, however, reserved as a prerogative of the Executive Committee of the Commission so that in the final analysis the Commission remains a self-perpetuating body and " its membership cannot be effectively called in question by the general electorate ".

The American Society of Parasitologists invites the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology to consider through its Section on Nomenclature the strengthening of the authority of the International Commission and the International Rules by modifying the procedures of the Commission and/or the method of electing Commissioners so that its membership can be effectively called in question by the general electorate to which it is responsible, namely those scientists who must follow its decisions. It is not recommended that the Commission revert to its previous system, but it is hoped that the advances made at Paris can be extended so that all zoologists may feel that they have a voice in determining the membership of the Commission, and will thereby cease to regard the Commission as functioning both in legislative and judicial capacities and also acting both as judge and jury.

In conclusion the Society reaffirms its vital interest in international co-operation toward the attainment of uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.

Signed for the Society by its Committee :

ALLEN McINTOSH
D. H. WENRICH
G. H. WHARTON, *Chairman.*

c.c. Mr. F. Hemming, Secretary,
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DOCUMENT 64/2

THE PRESENT RULES GOVERNING THE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, THE ELECTION OF ITS MEMBERS AND ITS PROCEDURE

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In the document enclosed with its letter of 30th October, 1952 (Document 64/1) the American Society of Parasitologists has asked that consideration should be given at Copenhagen to the question of the procedures of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and/or the method of electing its members with a view to strengthening the authority of the Commission by ensuring that its membership is effectively responsible to the general electorate, namely, those scientists who must follow its decisions. Other aspects of the same question are raised in two documents received from the Nomenclature Committee of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Documents 67/1 and 68/1) and by Dr. Henning Lemche in correspondence which has been reproduced as Document 66/1. Although the subjects raised in these documents are essentially distinct—and for this reason have in the present series been allotted separate Case Numbers—they all fall within the field covered by the document prepared by the American Society of Parasitologists. It is proposed, therefore, that these subjects should be treated as constituent parts of a single whole.

2. Everyone will agree that it is important to ensure that the rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure should be those best calculated to secure that the Commission shall function as efficiently as possible and to the general satisfaction of zoologists and palaeontologists. It is important, therefore, that, when these matters come to be discussed at Copenhagen, the discussion should take as its starting point the rules at present in force—all the more so in that some of the documents referred to above show evident misunderstandings regarding the nature of those rules.

3. As Secretary to the International Commission, I have concluded, therefore, that it will be to the general convenience if I set out as briefly as possible what the present rules are and what is their purpose. This I do in the present paper. I deal first with the question of the rules in force to secure that the composition of the International Commission shall be as representative as possible. From this I pass to the question of the rules at present in force in regard to the nomination and election of members of the Commission, a question which, though closely concerned with the measures for securing as representative a character as possible for the International Commission, is

nevertheless a quite distinct subject. The next aspect of the present subject to be considered concerns the rules in force for securing the efficient discharge of their duties by the individual Members of the International Commission. Finally, there is the entirely separate subject of the rules governing the procedures for the conduct by the International Commission of its work. It is not possible within the compass of a short paper to give a full description of the procedures of the Commission currently in force. A short section has however been added on this subject, since it is touched upon in the paper submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists.

(1) Problems relating to the size and representative character of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

4. Regulations in force up to 1913 : For the limited purpose for which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was first established, it was considered that a body of five members would suffice. When, however, in 1898 it produced the report which it had been appointed to prepare, the Commission was found not to be unanimous and was criticised as not being sufficiently representative. In consequence, at the Fourth International Congress of Zoology held at Cambridge in that year, it was decided to seek a more representative character for the International Commission by increasing its membership from five to fifteen. A further effect of this change was to increase the number of countries represented on the Commission from five to eight. It is likely however that this latter result was largely accidental and that the elections made in 1898 were on a personal basis. To a considerable extent this would in any case have been inevitable, since membership of (and attendance at) the (Cambridge) Congress at which these elections were made was laid down as a condition of eligibility. The International Commission was converted into a Standing Organ of the Congress at Berlin in 1901 but no changes were then made in its composition. At the next (Sixth) Congress held at Berne in 1904, the system described in paragraph 19 below was introduced under which thereafter one-third of the membership of the Commission completed its service at each of the then-three-yearly Congresses, thus providing a means for renewing the authority of the Commission through the election by the Congress of members to fill the vacancies so created—though, in fact, as experience showed, those vacancies were normally filled by the re-election of the time-expired Commissioners when they were willing to accept re-election. In the period 1910–1913 wastage among the members of the Commission (most of whom had been first elected in 1898) was exceptionally high on account of death and retirements, and accordingly, in order to keep the Commission reasonably up to strength, arrangements were then made for filling these vacancies immediately, the interim elections so made being reported for approval to the next Congress. At that Congress—held at Monaco in 1913—the size of the Commission was increased from fifteen to eighteen.

5. Practice between the wars : During the period from 1913 up to the outbreak of war in 1939 the regulations governing the membership of the International Commission remained unchanged. But during that period a conscious effort was made by the Commission—largely under the influence of the late Dr. C. W. Stiles, then its Secretary—to secure for itself a more representative character. This effort took two forms : First, a deliberate attempt was made to increase the international character of the Commission by securing —on vacancies arising—that a larger number of countries should be represented on the Commission. Second, a consistent attempt was made (though not always with success) to ensure that the membership of the Commission should include specialists in each of the main Phyla of the Animal Kingdom.

6. Difficulties in the period 1913-1939 caused by the small number of Congresses held : The fact that during the 26-year period 1913–1939 there were only three International Congresses of Zoology threw completely out of gear the arrangements made at Berne in 1904 for the renewal of one-third of the membership of the Commission by each Congress. Accordingly, it was necessary, in order to prevent the Commission from wasting away, to make use consistently of the authority granted by the Ninth (Monaco) Congress for the election by the Commission of new members to fill vacancies as they arose. It cannot be said that the machinery then in existence for this purpose worked satisfactorily, for the lack of any provisions prescribing the principles to be followed in maintaining the membership of the Commission, as regards either the distribution of seats by countries or by types of specialised knowledge, tended, despite the efforts to which I have already referred, to create a stereotyped situation in which the general composition of the Commission showed little change. Elections were made during this period by correspondence among the members of the Commission ; the first stage consisted of a request to members to suggest possible candidates ; the second consisted of a vote on the candidates so suggested. Commonly, the process was very protracted, extending over eighteen months to two years. It is no matter for surprise that under a haphazard system of this kind the results were often not satisfactory. In consequence the average age of zoologists on first election to the Commission was high ; in many cases their term of service was short and their capacity for work much less than it had been earlier in their careers. Once a zoologist had been elected to be a Commissioner, there was a tendency for him to remain one, even after he had ceased—by reason of age or infirmity—to discharge the full burden of work entailed by membership of the Commission.

7. The Princeton (N.J., U.S.A.) Plan of December 1947 : Immediately after the close of the late war consideration was given (by correspondence) by the Executive Committee of the International Commission to the question of placing the membership of the International Commission upon a basis that would be both more genuinely international and more genuinely representative in character. It was a desire to pursue these discussions to a point where definite proposals could be formulated for consideration both by the Commission as a whole and, if the Commission agreed, by the next (Thirteenth)

International Congress then due to be held in Paris in 1948 which prompted the then President of the Commission (Dr. Karl Jordan) and the Secretary (Mr. Francis Hemming) to the conclusion that it was desirable that a preliminary meeting should be held between the Secretary, the then Vice-President (Dr. James L. Peters) and as many as possible of the American members of the Commission. This led to the meeting held at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. in December 1947, at which, in addition to the Vice-President and the Secretary, there were present also the three other United States Commissioners (Professor J. Chester Bradley ; Professor Harold E. Vokes ; Dr. Norman R. Stoll). At that meeting agreement was reached on the submission to the International Commission and the next Congress of a Plan for giving express effect to the principles which should govern the composition of the Commission which had been aimed at—though with only limited success—during the inter-war years. The recommendations then agreed upon were embodied in a document which was submitted to the Commission and the Congress at Paris in July 1948. This paper was later (1950) published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (**3** : 6–15). So far as concerns the size and composition of the International Commission, those recommendations may be summarised as follows :—

(1) that the system under which the International Commission had a fixed membership of eighteen should be replaced by one under which, while the number eighteen was to be retained as the minimum membership, there should be no fixed membership, the number of members at any one time being such number as might be required to give effect to the proposal in (2) below ;

(2) that the Commission should be empowered to elect to its membership a specialist or specialists to represent zoologists and/or palaeontologists of any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work was being conducted where such specialists in that country so desired ;

(3) that elections to the membership of the Commission should be made in such a way as to secure, as far as practicable, that there should be an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission (a) as between one country and another, and (b) as between different types of knowledge and experience as regards work both on the systematics of the principal divisions of the Animal Kingdom and work in those branches of applied science which are effected by changes in zoological nomenclature.

8. Decisions taken in Paris in 1948 : The Princeton Plan summarised in the preceding paragraph were considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris at a meeting held on 21st July, 1948 (Third Meeting of Paris Session). The Official Record of the discussion on this proposal and of the conclusion reached is given on pages 37 to 40 of volume 4

of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (published in 1950). The proposals so submitted were approved by the Commission which decided at the same time to lay down in somewhat greater detail the principles to be observed in electing members to the Commission to secure the desired balance in the membership of the Commission as between different types of knowledge and experience. Further, it was agreed (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 43, point (6)) that in addition to national representatives the membership of the Commission might include any zoologist, irrespective of his nationality, whose election by reason of his special knowledge and experience, would, it was considered, be of value to the work of the Commission.

9. Action taken since 1948 under the decisions reached in Paris : Since the meeting held in Paris in 1948 six elections have been made to the membership of the Commission. These were all of what may be called a routine nature, that is, none of them involved calling to the membership of the Commission zoologists of countries not previously represented on that body : Four of these elections were concerned with making good wastage which had occurred as the result of the recent war ; these were the re-election of the Japanese and Polish Representatives (Professor Esaki and Professor Jaczewski) and the election (on German nomination) of two zoologists to fill the German vacancies on the Commission. The two remaining elections had as their purpose the filling of vacancies created by death (the election of Professor Bonnet *vice* the late Professor Rode as the French Representative) or by retirement (the election of Mr. Riley *vice* Dr. Karl Jordan). It may be noted that several applications for membership of the Commission to represent zoologists of countries not possessing a seat on the Commission have been received and are now pending. Of these we may note particularly applications received from the National Committee on Zoological Nomenclature in Czechoslovakia, from the National Science Council in Israel and, more recently, from the group of institutions speaking for zoologists in Austria. The elections described above raised the total membership of the International Commission at one time to twenty members, advantage thus being taken of the decision taken in Paris to waive the previously existing upper limit of eighteen for the membership of the Commission. Owing to wastage by death three vacancies have since occurred which have not yet been filled. In consequence the total number of Commissioners is now seventeen.

10. The problem created by the multiple representation of the zoologists of certain countries in the membership of the International Commission : The scheme drawn up by the Princeton meeting and subsequently approved in Paris provided for the membership of the International Commission being both genuinely international in character and representative of the various fields of knowledge and experience of importance to zoological nomenclature. There was, however, one thorny question affecting the membership of the Commission which was not dealt with either in the Princeton Plan or later in Paris. This is the problem created by the multiple representation of several countries. The countries concerned are : (1) the United States which have

four seats on the Commission ; (2) the United Kingdom, which has three seats, and (3) Germany, which has two seats. This arrangement is of long standing (dating back to well before the Lisbon meeting of 1935) and has been continued on a traditional basis. It may well be thought that the time has come for an express decision regulating this aspect of the composition, for, in the absence of an express decision by the International Congress, the existence of multiple representation on an international body is certainly anomalous, particularly when there are still countries not represented on the Commission, despite the expressed wish of zoologists in those countries for such representation.

(2) Problems involved in the nomination and election of zoologists and palaeontologists to be members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

11. The procedure for the election of members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to 1939 : As already explained (paragraphs 4–6) the procedure for the election of members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature up to the year 1939 was of the most haphazard character, no principles having been laid down for guidance in this matter. The procedure adopted for this purpose was also extremely slow-moving and incapable of filling vacancies within a reasonable period of their occurrence. Under this system a vacancy arising in the representation of zoologists who were nationals of one of the Great Powers was normally filled by the election of a zoologist who was of the same nationality as the Commissioner, whose death or retirement had given rise to the vacancy in question. When, however, a vacancy occurred in a seat held by a zoologist belonging to a country, other than one of the Great Powers, it was purely a matter of chance to what country the zoologist elected to succeed him belonged. As the records of the International Commission show, that body—and its members—experienced great difficulty in deciding, unaided from outside, upon suitable nominations ; in general, members of the Commission, while prepared to take soundings as to possible new Commissioners from their own countries, were unwilling to undertake the invidious and inappropriate task of suggesting as candidates zoologists of other countries. Under such a system it was inevitable that the distribution of seats on the Commission as between zoologists of various countries should tend to become stereotyped on the existing pattern. Inevitably, it was a matter of pure chance whether under such a system of election the zoologists elected commanded the full confidence of fellow-workers in their own countries. Inevitably also this method of election tended to secure the election of elderly men or of men in late middle life, for it was not to be expected that, when an outside body, such as the Commission, attempted to select candidates from particular countries, they should select younger men, when better known veterans in those countries were available and naturally, in a sense, formed a much safer choice.

12. Position between 1939 and 1948 : The outbreak of war in Europe made it necessary temporarily to entrust to the Executive Committee of certain of the functions formerly exercised by the Commission as a whole. The functions so temporarily transferred included the filling, on an interim basis, of vacancies when these were reported as having occurred in the representation on the Commission of countries with which postal communications were still open. This was deemed to be essential for the purpose of keeping the International Commission in being, having regard to the fact that no one could at that time foresee how long the war would last—for the failure to take similar action during the war of 1914–1918 had left the Commission so weakened by wastage that its rehabilitation in the immediate post-war period had been a matter of great difficulty. In making these provisional interim elections, the Executive Committee abandoned the pre-war practice of the Commission—under which the nomination of candidates had come from within the Commission itself—and in place of that policy looked for assistance and advice in the matter of nominations from leading scientific authorities in the countries in which the vacancies to be filled were situated.

13. The Princeton (N.J., U.S.A.) Plan of December 1947 : As in the case of the problems arising in connection with the size and composition of the International Commission (see 7 above), so also the problem of the reform of the rules governing the nomination and election of members of the Commission formed an important part of the business discussed at the meeting between the Vice-President and the three other United States members of the Commission and the Secretary held in December 1947 at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. That meeting drew up proposals on this subject for submission to the International Commission and the next Congress of Zoology then due to be held some seven months later in Paris. The proposals so agreed upon were embodied in a document which was laid before the Commission for consideration when it met in Paris in July 1948. This was the same document as that in which was embodied the Princeton Plan for the introduction of new provisions relating to the size and composition of the Commission ; as already noted this document was later (1950) published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (**3** : 6–15). The main purpose of this Plan was to extend, and to place on a regular basis, the policy which (as has been explained in paragraph 12 above) had then lately been initiated by the Executive Committee under which responsibility for the nomination of candidates for membership of the Commission was, so far as possible, transferred from the Commission to the principal scientific authority or authorities of the country from which it was desired to obtain a new Commissioner. The main features of the Plan so submitted may be summarised as follows :—

(1) that, whenever it was desired to fill vacancy in the membership of the Commission or to obtain a Commissioner from a country not previously represented on the Commission, the Executive Committee, acting for the Commission, should seek a nomination

from that country, either through the diplomatic channel or direct by application to an appropriate Government Department of the country concerned or to the National Academy of Science or some other leading scientific institution or learned society in that country ;

(2) that, on receipt of a nomination obtained in this way, it should be the duty of the Executive Committee to satisfy itself on such matters as that the election of the candidate proposed would not conflict with the desired balance within the Commission of various types of knowledge and experience (as to which see Point (3) in the summary given in paragraph 7 above, of the portion of the Princeton Plan relating to the principles which should govern the composition of the Commission) ;

(3) that, on the Executive Committee having satisfied itself on the matters referred to in (2) above, it should forthwith elect to the membership of the Commission the zoologist who had been nominated a candidate in the manner indicated in (1) above.

14. Decisions taken in Paris in 1948 : The Princeton Plan (summarised in the preceding paragraph) was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris at a meeting held on 21st July, 1948 (Third Meeting of the Paris Session). The Official Record of the discussion on these proposals and on the conclusion reached is given on pages 40 to 44 of volume 4 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. In the discussion which then took place great stress was laid on the wide diversity of the form of scientific organisation adopted in different countries and on the importance of ensuring that the rules to be adopted for securing nominations from particular countries should be sufficiently elastic to enable account to be taken of the differences referred to above. It was felt (: 41) that by reason of these differences in national organisation a channel of communication which would be an appropriate, and, in some cases, the only appropriate, channel of communication for some countries would be inappropriate or totally impracticable in the case of other countries. For example, the United States zoologists present at this discussion expressed the view that, so far as the United States was concerned, neither an approach to a Government Department nor one to the National Academy would be appropriate. In the discussion on the Princeton Plan the view was expressed also (: 42) that the adoption of the representative principle as the basis on which the membership of the Commission was in future to be built up ought not to be carried to a point at which the Commission would lose control over the selection of persons to be elected as Commissioners, for it was felt that it would not always happen that the consultative method would provide candidates possessed both of high professional distinction and of the personal qualities requisite to make an efficient member of the Commission. In its broad outlines the Princeton Plan was approved by the International Commission (and later by the Section on

Nomenclature and the Congress in Plenary Session). The scheme so approved differed however from the Princeton Plan in respect of those matters where the discussion had shown a desire that that Plan should be modified. Chief among these modifications were : (1) the various possible channels of communication were re-arranged in the reverse order to that suggested in the Princeton Plan, that is, leading scientific institutions and learned societies were placed first in the list, Government Agencies and the diplomatic channel being placed last ; (2) the duties relating to the scrutiny by the Executive Committee of the Commission of nominations submitted through the channels referred to in (1) above were elaborated, (3) a provision was inserted authorising the Executive Committee itself to elect to the membership of the Commission, as a non-territorial member, any zoologist, irrespective of nationality, where it was satisfied that, by reason of the special knowledge and experience possessed by the zoologist in question, his election would be of value to the work of the Commission ; (4) on the occurrence of a casual vacancy in the membership of the Commission, the Executive Committee, instead of being required (as proposed in the Princeton Plan) to consult national authorities in the same way as that proposed on the occasion of the election of a national representative for a country not previously represented on the Commission, should have the option either to do so or itself to nominate and elect a zoologist of the country concerned to fill the vacancy in question.

15. The flaw in the plan for securing nominations decided upon in Paris in 1948 : The decisions taken in Paris in 1948 for regulating the method to be followed in obtaining nominations of candidates for election to the membership of the Commission suffer from one serious defect arising out of a departure then decided upon from the suggestions which had been submitted in the Princeton Plan. That Plan recognised that in different countries forms of scientific organisation differed so much that the rule to be adopted would need to provide a choice of such channels, thereby ensuring that in any given case there should be an appropriate channel available. It was an essential feature of that Plan that for any given country there should be one channel of consultation and one channel only, that channel being through the diplomatic channel or direct through a Government Department of the country concerned or to the National Academy of Science of the country concerned or to some leading scientific institution or learned society in that country, whichever might, in any given case, be considered the most appropriate. The decision in Paris to place scientific institutions and learned societies first in the list and the clear intimation by the United States zoologists present that, so far as their country was concerned, neither the diplomatic channel nor a Government Agency nor the National Academy of Science would be regarded by United States zoologists as appropriate channels of communication broke the unity of advice which it had been the object of the Princeton Plan to secure. The result has been that —to take a practical and recent experience—there is now no means open to the Executive Committee to secure a single nomination from the United States to fill a United States vacancy. Accordingly, in this—and any similar case which might arise—the Executive Committee can only apply to the

leading museums and learned societies for nominations—a method which cannot be expected to provide the Executive Committee with a unanimous recommendation. Thus, in cases of this sort it has—under the Paris decisions—proved impossible to secure the prime object sought by the Princeton Plan, namely, to place squarely upon the shoulders of zoologists and palaeontologists in every country the responsibility for providing an agreed nomination of a candidate to fill a vacancy in the national representation of that country on the International Commission. In the case of the United States, it is clear from the documents submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists (Document 64/1) and from the Nomenclature Committee of the Chicago Natural History Museum (Document 67/1) that at least some specialists are not satisfied with the present regulations in regard to the procedure for securing nominations for candidates for election to the Commission and it is much to be hoped that it will be found possible to devise means acceptable to United States specialists which will place upon themselves the duty of providing an agreed nomination to fill any United States vacancy on the Commission, whenever such arises, in place of the present system by which, under the Paris decision, it falls to the Executive Committee of the Commission to undertake the inappropriate and invidious task of itself making a choice from a number of competing nominations from institutions in the United States.

16. Reason for the transfer in 1948 of the duty of electing members of the Commission from the total membership of the Commission to the Executive Committee of that body : In its communication on the subject of the organisation of the Commission (Document 64/1) the American Society of Parasitologists calls in question the wisdom of the decision taken in Paris in 1948 to transfer from the general membership of the Commission to the Executive Committee of that body the responsibility of electing members of the Commission. It may perhaps be convenient, therefore, to note in this connection that this change as conceived in the Princeton Plan where it was first suggested, formed part of the general purpose of that Plan to transfer as much as possible of the responsibility in connection with the appointment of new Commissioners to the zoologists and palaeontologists of the country concerned, retaining for the Commission only certain duties of scrutiny, together with the actual right of election. The scrutiny of the qualifications of candidates would, it was hoped and expected, raise no issue for discussion, except on the rarest of occasions and the actual act of election in the case of a candidate nominated by the fellow-workers of his own country would, after the completion of the prescribed scrutiny of credentials, be purely formal. It was accordingly considered that the duties in connection with the election of proposed Commissioners still to be retained might with advantage be discharged by the Executive Committee rather than by the full membership of the Commission, for (1) if the prescribed scrutiny were in any given case to raise an issue calling for consideration, the situation resulting would inevitably be delicate and one best handled by a small body such as the Commission's Executive Committee, while (2) in any case where no issue arose out of the scrutiny, it would be an empty and pointless formality to remit the formal act of election to the entire membership of the

Commission, having regard to the fact that under the scheme any specialist who had been duly nominated by the national authority in his country and as regards whom no point arose on the prescribed scrutiny should be elected without question to the membership of the Commission.

17. The Chicago Museum's proposal that the names of candidates for election to the membership of the International Commission should be subject to public advertisement : In a brief communication reproduced in the present series as Document 67/1 the Committee on Nomenclature suggest (1) that definite standards of eligibility be adopted for nominees to vacant positions in the Commission, and (2) that lists of such nominees should be published by the International Commission at least three months before each Congress. The proposal does not refer to elections made by the Commission during inter-Congress periods, but, as it is on these occasions that for the most part zoologists are first elected to the Commission to fill vacancies arising from death and other causes, it may be assumed that the proposal relates so such elections also. This proposal is clearly designed to ensure the highest obtainable standard of personal distinction among the members of the International Commission and the widest degree of acceptability that can be obtained for candidates for election to the Commission. Every one will agree with these general purposes, and the only subject for discussion will therefore be whether these particular measures are well adapted to secure the end in view. As Secretary to the International Commission, I am of the opinion that these proposals are not so adapted. Evidence from every side suggests a growing desire among zoologists and palaeontologists to have a share in the selection of the fellow-countryman who is to serve as their representative on the International Commission. Further, as might have been expected, the foregoing tendency is accompanied by a growing sensitiveness of outside—i.e. from the standpoint of the country concerned, foreign—intervention in the matter of the selection of national representatives to serve on the Commission. I feel bound to say that, in my view, the particular proposals now under consideration would cut right across the system now in process of being built up under which the responsibility for nominating candidates for election to the Commission is passing into the hands of the zoologists and palaeontologists of the countries concerned through the development of agreed channels for the submission of nominations from the appropriate scientific authorities in the countries concerned. In my view, this system, better than any other, should lead to the nomination from each country of a candidate of high personal distinction and enjoying also the confidence and esteem of fellow workers in his own country.

(3) Problem involved in providing for the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

18. Suggestions received in relation to the proposed adoption of provisions designed to ensure the due discharge of their duties by individual Commissioners : In a paper published in the present series as Document 68/1 the Committee

on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum has raised the question of introducing provisions designed to secure the due discharge of their duties by individual Commissioners and has put forward two suggestions by way of alternatives ; under the first of these suggestions the number of terms of service as a member of the Commission permissible to any person (other than the Secretary) would be limited to three, while under the second a compulsory retirement age would be established for members of the Commission. The need for an effective system under which members of the Commission would be required to account for their stewardship to the general body of zoologists is referred to also by the American Society of Parasitologists in the paper which they have submitted (Document 64/1) but no definite suggestions are put forward by the Society. Everyone will agree that the above is an important subject as regards which adequate safeguards are necessary and a periodical review of those safeguards desirable. In order to facilitate such a review I give in the present Section a description of the provisions actually in force today—as to which the foregoing documents disclose certain misunderstandings—and explain how it came about that those provisions were considered better suited to secure the desired end than other suggestions which had been previously considered.

19. Arrangements in force up to 1948 : Prior to the meeting of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948, the membership of the International Commission, which was then limited in size to eighteen members, was divided into three " Classes ", each elected for a term of nine years. It was so arranged when this system was introduced that one of these Classes completed its term of service every three years. At that time the International Congress of Zoology met normally at three-yearly intervals and the retirement of these Classes coincided with these meetings, thus making it possible for the filling of a new Class (of six Commissioners) to be conducted at the meeting of the Congress and subject to its approval. Where a vacancy arose during an inter-Congress period—as happened occasionally through the death or resignation of Commissioners—the zoologist then elected to the Commission was placed in the " Class " in the membership of the Commission which had fallen vacant. Interim elections, so made, were subject to approval by the next following Congress. Under this system it might happen—and did sometimes happen—that a zoologist was elected to a Class which had very nearly completed its nine-year term of service and, in consequence, had to submit himself for re-election very shortly after he had become a member of the Commission.

20. Objections to the pre-1948 system : After 1913 the system described above lost such merits as it may orginally have possessed, for never after that year did the International Congress meet in a year which corresponded with the termination of the period of service of one of the Classes in the membership of the Commission—and, indeed, it only once met with so short an interval from the preceding Congress as three years. In order to secure that part of the membership of the Commission should complete its service at each Congress,

whenever it might be held, an arrangement was made during the inter-war years under which the Class in the membership of the Commission which had served the longest was deemed to have completed its term on the last days of the next Congress, even though it had not completed the full nine-year term for which it had been elected. The system of nine-year Classes was, however, maintained, although it now served no useful purpose and its perpetuation merely involved unnecessary correspondence and waste of time during inter-Congress periods, since the whole proceeding was an empty formality.

21. The present system introduced in 1949 : The question of introducing reforms designed to secure a more effective system for the periodical renewal of the membership of the International Commission was discussed towards the end of the war by the Executive Committee by correspondence, and later in December 1947 at the meeting held at Princeton, N.J., U.S.A., which was attended by all the United States members of the Commission and myself as Secretary. At this meeting recommendations were drawn up (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 6–15) for consideration when the International Commission and the International Congress met in July 1948. These recommendations were brought forward for discussion at the Third Meeting of the International Commission during its Session held in Paris (Meeting held on 21st July, 1948). For the Official Record of the conclusion then reached, see Conclusion 3 of the foregoing meeting (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 44–46). Shortly, the decision then taken (which was later approved by the Congress) was (1) that the obsolete system of Classes should be abolished, (2) that in future the names of members of the Commission should be placed on a list arranged in accordance with the order in which they had been elected to the Commission or, if they were serving a second or later term, the date on which they were re-elected or last re-elected to the Commission, (3) that at each meeting of the Congress one-third of the members of the Commission should vacate their position as such, the members in question being those at the head of the list referred to in (2) above. This change was accompanied by the further reform described in paragraph 23 below designed to secure the removal from the membership of the Commission of any zoologist who might have failed to discharge the duties of his office.

22. Question of the introduction of an age-limit for the compulsory retirement of members of the International Commission : In the later part of the war consideration was given by the Executive Committee of the International Commission to the question whether it would be desirable to introduce a compulsory age-limit on attaining which members of the Commission would automatically vacate their position and would be ineligible for re-election. There was full agreement that some reform was needed in order to prevent the recurrence in the future of cases such as had occurred in the past where a zoologist who was a member of the Commission had become, by reason of age or infirmity, unfit to perform his duties but out of the high regard and

esteem in which he was personally held had been permitted to retain his membership of the Commission. In at least one case also a quite young zoologist had been elected to be a Commissioner but being, as it appeared, unfitted for membership of a body working mainly by correspondence, had never once voted upon a proposed *Opinion* submitted during his term of service. On the other hand, there had been shining examples of men—of whom the late Dr. Leonard Stejneger of Washington, D.C., and Dr. Karl Jordan of Tring were pre-eminent—who far into old age had served with the utmost distinction, and had indeed discharged their duties as members of the Commission, including acting as consultants on difficult questions involving detailed bibliographical investigations, in a manner unequalled by most of their younger colleagues. It was felt by the Executive Committee that a compulsory age for retirement would be open to considerable objection in that it would deprive the Commission prematurely of outstanding personalities whose retirement would be a serious loss. On the other hand, it was considered that a qualified retirement-age (that is, an age-limit at which retirement would be compulsory, except where some authorised body decided otherwise) would be of doubtful utility, for the task of deciding whether a given Commissioner on attaining the age-limit, should be invited to serve for a further period would clearly be most invidious, whatever the body to which the duty of taking such decisions might be ; the likelihood, it was felt, was that a provision of this kind would quickly become almost a dead letter, the probability being that the authorising body would escape from its difficulties by granting renewals in the majority of cases. It was concluded, therefore, that it would be better to seek some alternative method for weeding out of the membership of the Commission any zoologist who failed to discharge his duties.

23. Procedure adopted in 1948 for the purpose of ensuring the due discharge of their duties by members of the International Commission : In the preceding paragraph I have explained how it was that in 1948 it was decided to seek some way, other than by instituting an age-limit for retirement, of securing the due performance of their duties by the members of the International Commission. The solution adopted was a provision under which a member of the Commission would in future forfeit his position as such if on five successive occasions he failed to register his vote on the drafts of *Declarations* or *Opinions* submitted for decision, save where he could produce a satisfactory explanation (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 49, Conclusion 4(b)). Other reforms instituted at the same time were :—(a) a provision under which, where a member of the Commission, by reason of going on a scientific expedition or for some other cause, knew that he would be unable to discharge his duties for a considerable period, leave of absence might be granted to him and an Alternate Member temporarily appointed in his place (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 48–49, Conclusion 4(a)), and (b) a provision for the automatic removal of a zoologist from membership of the Commission in the event of his incurring any of a number of specified disabilities (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 49, Conclusion 4(c)).

(4) The procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

24. Comment by the American Society of Parasitologists on the procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : In the document submitted by the American Society of Parasitologists (reproduced in the present series as Document 64/1) the Society raises the question whether the present procedure of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for dealing with individual nomenclatorial problems is the best suited for the purpose. At the same time the Society comments upon the decision taken in Paris in 1948 for the treatment to be accorded to votes by individual Commissioners, when those votes are given conditionally. It is clear that on both these points the Society is not fully informed as to what is the present procedure of the International Commission, and, as it is desirable that zoologists and palaeontologists generally should be fully aware of the procedure adopted in regard to these matters, it has been judged useful to add to the present paper the following short Section explaining the nature of the procedure actually in force.

25. Procedure followed in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions up to 1948 : In the period from 1907 (when the power to give decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions was first conferred upon the International Commission) to 1936, the Commission possessed no funds of its own and had no means at its disposal for bringing before the zoological public proposals on matters submitted to it for decision. Communication between the Secretary and the members of the Commission itself in regard to such matters was conducted through the circulation of carbon typescripts. It was largely to rectify these weaknesses in organisation that it was decided in 1943 to establish a serial publication—the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* —for the publication of applications submitted to the Commission. A further purpose underlying the establishment of the *Bulletin* was the provision of a medium for the publication of comments received from interested specialists in regard to applications published in earlier Parts of that serial. The long period required for printing in the immediate post-war period and other causes made it possible by the time of the Paris meeting in 1948 to publish in the *Bulletin* a part only of the arrears of applications which had accumulated during the war period, and it was in the hope of making a substantial inroad into those arrears that at Paris decisions were taken by the Commission on a considerable number of applications which had not been published in the *Bulletin*. This partial reversion to the pre-war system was recognised at the time as being an exceptional measure designed to overcome a special difficulty.

26. Procedure followed since 1948 in reaching decisions on individual nomenclatorial questions : The period following the Paris meetings was occupied entirely with the preparation and publication of the records of those meetings until about the middle of the year 1950, and it was not until the spring of 1951 that it was possible to commence the publication of a volume (volume 2) of the *Bulletin* devoted to applications relating to individual zoological names. From that time onwards the publication of such applications

—after the completion of volume 2, in volumes 6 and 9—proceeded steadily, save for an interval in the winter of 1951–1952 when work was suspended in order to permit of the preparation of a special volume (vol. 7) of the *Bulletin* devoted to certain major nomenclatorial problems affecting the text of the *Règles* which had been remitted by the Paris Congress for consideration by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953 and on which it was desired to obtain advice from interested specialists. The volumes of the *Bulletin* dealing with problems relating to individual names contained also the comments received from specialists on applications published in earlier Parts. Owing to the period of six months prescribed by the Paris Congress as the interval to be observed after the publication of applications and the taking of a decision thereon it was some time after the commencement of the publication of volume 2 of the *Bulletin* before the Commission was in a position to start voting (by post) on the applications in question. Prior to the start of voting consideration was given to the form of Voting Paper to be employed. Ultimately a standard form of Voting Paper was evolved which, after stating the date by which votes are returnable, (1) gives a bibliographical reference to the place in the *Bulletin* in which the application has been published, (2) reports, in Plenary Powers applications, the action taken to " advertise " the application under the prescribed procedure, (3) gives particulars of all comments received in regard to the application with bibliographical references to such of those applications as have been received in sufficient time to be published in the *Bulletin*, (4) in some cases, gives a brief comment such as a note calling attention to evidence contained in the application itself as to the views of interested specialists or noting that a decision on the case in question is desired in connection with the preparation of some book (e.g. the international *Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology*), and (5) calls for a vote on the application submitted. In cases where no opposition to the application has been received from any quarter or where the support is large and the opposition small, Members of the Commission are asked to vote for, or against the proposal submitted by the applicant. Where however, it is clear that opinion on the issue involved is substantially divided, Members of the Commission are asked to vote for one of two specified affirmative proposals ; the first of these is the proposal submitted by the applicant, the second a proposal which is the exact opposite of that asked for by the applicant and represents, therefore, a decision rejecting that proposal.

27. It is important that zoologists and palaeontologists generally should be fully aware of the strictly objective character of the procedure adopted by the Commission in voting upon applications submitted to it. The foregoing explanation of the form of voting in use is accordingly supplemented by the reproduction *in extenso* of two Voting Papers issued in 1952. Of these the first, which is V.P.(52)47 (i.e. the 47th Voting Paper issued in 1952), is concerned with certain names in the Order Mallophaga (Class Insecta) in which the use of the Plenary Powers was asked for, where (a) the prescribed advertisement procedure had elicited no objections, (b) attention was drawn to the evidence contained in the application of a canvas carried out by the applicant of the views of fellow-workers which showed that of the fourteen workers concerned

twelve supported the application and two dissented from it on the ground that they were opposed to any use of the Plenary Powers. In this case, as will be seen, the Members of the Commission were invited to vote for, or against, the application submitted. The second of the Voting Papers reproduced in *facsimile* is V.P.(53)4, which is concerned with the highly controversial case of the application of the names *Crangon* and *Alpheus* as published by Weber in 1795 and by Fabricius in 1798 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). In this case it will be seen that after an enumeration of the expressions of opinion received for, and against, the proposal submitted by the applicant, and after attention had been drawn to surveys of the literature furnished by the applicant and by a leading zoologist opposed to the proposal submitted, the Members of the Commission were asked to vote for one or other of two specified affirmative proposals. The first of these (styled Alternative "A") embodied the proposal submitted by the applicant, the second (styled Alternative " B ") represented the decision required in the event of the rejection of the application submitted.

28. Provision for conditional voting approved in Paris in 1948 : The American Society of Parasitologists express (in Document 64/1) some apprehension regarding the decision taken in Paris in 1948 that in the counting of votes cast by Commissioners in postal voting on cases of individual names and kindred matters any vote cast conditionally (that is, in any case where a Commissioner states that he is willing to cast his vote in whichever direction is favoured by the majority of the Commission) is to be treated as an affirmative vote (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 50–51). It may therefore be appropriate to explain the origin of the foregoing proposal. It was this : In the period prior to 1936, Commissioners who failed to vote often excused themselves for their failure to perform the duties of their office on the ground that they possessed no personal knowledge of the merits of the application in question. Failure to vote on cases submitted constituted a severe handicap to the work of the Commission at that time since under the regulations then in force, even the simplest proposal required for its acceptance not only a majority of the votes cast in the Commission but also a number of votes greater than half the total membership of the Commission. Although this latter difficulty was removed in Paris, it was then nevertheless considered improper that a member of the Commission should be free to shelter himself completely by excuses of the foregoing kind. It was considered that if on conscientious grounds a Commissioner felt unable to vote in either sense on any given proposal, it would be reasonable to give him the opportunity, should he so desire, to discharge his duty by expressing a willingness to associate himself with the majority opinion of the Commission on the case concerned. In considering this matter, the Commission felt that the adoption of this procedure by a Commissioner could reasonably be held as clearing him from the charge of neglect of the duties of his office and of the risk of being removed from his office for failure to discharge those duties. In actual practice very little use has been made of the provision here under consideration, for out of the 969 votes cast by Commissioners in 1952 on the sixty cases submitted for vote, only six were cast under the special provision discussed above.

ANNEXE 1 TO DOCUMENT 64/2

Reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47 relating to certain generic names in the Order Mallophaga (Class Insecta)

(1) Front Page of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47

Z.N.(S.) 343

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CALL FOR A VOTE

ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE NAME Lipeurus, Colpocephalum, and Gyropus, all of Nitzsch, 1818 (Class Insecta, Order Mallophaga)

Letter of Transmittal

Dear Commissioner,

You will find overleaf a Voting Paper on the above application. You are asked to complete this and return it to me as soon as possible. The prescribed period within which Votes may be given by post is **three months** calculated from the date on which the Voting Paper concerned is issued from the Office of the Commission. In the present case the latest date by which your Vote should reach this Office is therefore 15th August, 1952.

2. I have verified independently the factual presentation of this application to the best of my ability.

3. I give below, for information, the following brief note on the present case.

Yours sincerely,
(*Signed*) FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1, England.

Date of despatch : 15 May 1952.

Notes relating to the present case

1. *Application published:* Bull. 6:54-60 (G. H. E. Hopkins)

2. Compliance with the prescribed advertisement procedure: This case, which involves the possible use of the Commission's plenary powers, has been duly advertised in the prescribed serial publications and

Continuation of Front Page of V.P.(52)47)

in addition also in certain other zoological and entomological such publications. No objection has been received.

3. Support received: Support has been received from Ernst Mayr (American Museum of Natural History, New York) (6:210) as an ornithologist.

4. Comment: It will be recalled (6:59) that, before this application was submitted to the Commission, the problems at issue were the subject of discussion and correspondence between all the available leading workers in the Mallophaga. Of the fourteen specialists who took part in these discussions twelve gave it their support, while two dissented on the ground that they were opposed to any use of the plenary powers. The names of the fourteen specialists concerned are given on the page of the application cited above.

(2) Back Page of Voting Paper V.P.(52)47

V.P. (1952) 47

VOTING PAPER

I vote {**for** / **against**}* the proposal relating to the names Lipeurus, Colpocephalum and Gyropus, all of Nitzsch, 1818, as set out in Points (1) to (5) at the foot of page 59 and on page 60 of Volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, subject to the correction of the two printers' errors on 60 noted at the foot of the present Voting Paper.

Signature of Commissioner :.....

Date of signature :.....

***Note.—Delete whichever of the alternative words is inappropriate.**

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. This Vote, should be completed and returned as soon as possible to Francis Hemming, Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1, England. The latest date by which this Voting Paper should be received by the Secretary is 15th August, 1952.
2. Commissioners residing outside Europe are requested to reply by airmail.
3. Commissioners are reminded that failure to vote on three successive occasions renders a Commissioner liable to removal from his Office as such.

Correction of two printers' errors: Page 60, lines 5 and 6:

In each case the date of the specific name is incorrectly stated to be ''1818''; the correct date is ''1838''. The names in question are therefore Colpocephalum zebra Burmeister, 1838, and Gyropus ovalis Burmeister, 1838.

ANNEXE 2 TO DOCUMENT 64/2

Reproduction of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4 relating to the generic names "Crangon" and "Alpheus" of Weber (1795) and Fabricius (1798) (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) respectively

(1) Front Page of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4

Z.N.(S.) 231

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CALL FOR A VOTE

ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE NAME Crangon Fabricius, 1798, Alpheus Fabricius, 1798, Crangon Weber, 1795 and Alpheus Weber, 1795 (Cl. Crustacea, Order Decapoda)

Letter of Transmittal

Dear Commissioner,

You will find overleaf a Voting Paper on the above application. You are asked to complete this and return it to me as soon as possible. The prescribed period within which Votes may be given by post is **three months** calculated from the date on which the Voting Paper concerned is issued from the Office of the Commission. In the present case the latest date by which your Vote should reach this Office is therefore 2nd April, 1953.

2. I have verified independently the factual presentation of this application to the best of my ability.

3. I give below, for information, the following brief note on the present case.

Yours sincerely,

(*Signed*) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1, England.

Date of despatch: 2nd January, 1953.

Notes relating to the present case

1. *Application published:* Bull. 2:69-72, 79-80 (L. B. Holthuis)

2. Compliance with the prescribed advertisement procedure: This case, which involves the possible use of the Commission's plenary powers, has been

(Continuation of Front Page of V.P.(53)4)

duly advertised in the prescribed serial publications and in addition also in certain other zoological serial publications.

3. Comments received:-As was to be expected in view of the deep division of practice in the use of these names by specialists, numerous letters have been received in regard to this application, some supporting it, others opposing it. The comments so received are summarised on Sheet No. 1 annexed.

(2) Back Page of Voting Paper V.P.(53)4

V.P.(1953) 4

VOTING PAPER

I vote* for the proposal set out in the annexed Sheet No. 2:-
ALTERNATIVE ''A'' (Dr. Holthuis' proposal),

OR

ALTERNATIVE ''B'' (action required if Dr. Holthuis' proposal were to be rejected).

Signature of Commissioner :.....

Date of signature : .....

***Note.—Delete whichever of the alternative** proposals you desire to reject.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. This Vote, should be completed and returned as soon as possible to Francis Hemming, Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England. The latest date by which this Voting Paper should be received by the Secretary is 2nd April, 1953.

2. Commissioners residing outside Europe are requested to reply by airmail.

3. Commissioners are reminded that failure to vote on three successive occasions renders a Commissioner liable to removal from his Office as such.

(First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

Sheet No. 1

Z.N.(S.) 231

Comments on the Alpheus/Crangon case

Nature of the problem: This application is concerned to secure a settlement of a long-standing difference of usage of the generic name Crangon and associated names. Up till 1904 the name Crangon, attributed to Fabricius, 1798, was universally applied to the Common Shrimp of Europe, while the name Alpheus, also attributed to Fabricius, 1798, was similarly used for Snapping Shrimps. In 1904 the late Miss Mary Rathbun drew attention to the Nomenclator entomologicus Fabricii of Weber published in 1795, in which the name Crangon was used for a species of Snapping Shrimp. Miss Rathbun at the same time pointed out that the name Alpheus Fabricius, 1798 was a junior homonym of Alpheus Weber, 1795, which latter name she made in 1930 an objective junior synonym of Cancer Linnaeus, 1758, by selecting Cancer pagurus Linnaeus, 1758, to be its type species. Miss Rathbun applied to the Common Shrimp the name Crago Lamarck, 1800 (that being the oldest available name therefor if the name Crangon Fabricius, 1798, could not be used for it). In 1910 there was published the Commission's Opinion 17, in which it ruled that, other things being equal, the generic names in Weber's Nomenclator of 1795 were available nomenclatorially. Gradually, Miss Rathbun's use of the names Crangon Weber and Crago Lamarck won considerable acceptance, but many workers refused to make the change. In consequence there has been-and still is-a complete lack of uniformity of nomenclatorial usage in this field.

2. Survey of current usage: Attention is particularly drawn to two papers, one by Dr. Fenner Chace (Washington) (Bull. 2:75-78), the other by Dr. L. B. Holthuis (Bull. 2:79-80), which survey the present state of usage of these names. These papers, being written by specialists who take opposing views of the solution which it is desirable should be reached in the present case, are particularly valuable, in that they afford to the Commission an agreed appreciation of the

(Continuation of First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(Continuation of Sheet No. 1)

position. As will be seen from those papers (1) an important weight of support attaches to both the contending usages; (2) a majority rejects the Weber names in favour of the later Fabrician names; the size of this majority depends (as will be seen) upon the extent to which the survey is restricted to work by specialists in this group, being the narrower if account is taken only of the work of active Decapod specialists.

3. Support received for Dr. Holthuis' proposal: Support for Dr. Holthuis' proposals has been received from the following:-

(1) Poul Heegaard (University of Copenhagen) (Bull. 2:73)

(2) The late Robert Gurney (England) (Bull. 2:74)

(3) Marie V. Lebour (The Laboratory, Citadel Hill, Plymouth, England) (Bull. 2:340)

(4) A. B. Needler (Fisheries Research Board of Canada, St. Andrews, N.B., Canada) (Bull. 2:342)

(5) N. Nouvel (Faculte des Sciences, Toulouse, France) (Bull. 2:342-343)

(6) Heinrich Balss (Zoologisches Staatssammlung, Munich, Germany) (Bull. 2:344)

(7) E. Sollaud (Universite de Lyon, Faculte des Sciences, Lyon, France) (Bull. 2:344)

(8) Ricardo Zariquiey (Barcelona, Spain) (Bull. 6:72)

(9) R. Ph. Dollfus (Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) (Bull. 6:181)

(10) I. Gordon (British Museum (Natural History), London) (Bull. 6:183)

4. Objections to Dr. Holthuis' proposal received: Objection to Dr. Holthuis' proposals has been received from the following:-

(1) E. Fenner Chace Jr. (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) (Bull. 2:75-78)

(Continuation of First Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(Continuation of Sheet No. 1)

(2) Albert H. Banner (University of Hawaii, Honolulu) (Bull. 2:74-75)

(3) Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) (Bull. 2:340)

(4) Frank A. McNeill (Australian Museum, Sydney, New South Wales) (Bull. 2:341)

(5) Charles H. Blake (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.) (Bull. 6:182-183)

(6) Herbert M. Hale (The South Australian Museum, Adelaide, South Australia) (Bull. 6:181)

(7) Belle A. Stevens (University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.) (Bull. 6:184)

5. Procedure adopted in presenting the present case for vote: In view of the marked differences of opinion which have been expressed by specialists as to the decision which it is desirable should be taken in the present case, I feel that, instead of voting ''yes'' or ''no'' on Dr. Holthuis' proposal, it would be more convenient for the Commission to vote on two alternative proposals, namely: (1) Alternative ''A'' (Dr. Holthuis' proposal); (2) Alternative ''B'' (rejection of Dr. Holthuis' proposal). I have agreed with Dr. Holthuis the form of the decision which would be needed if his proposal were to be rejected by the Commission. The Voting Paper now submitted has accordingly been prepared on the foregoing basis.

(Signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the Commission.

28th December, 1952.

(Second Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

Sheet No. 2

ALTERNATIVE ''A'' (Dr. L. B. Holthuis)

(1) Under the plenary powers the generic names Alpheus Weber, 1795, and Crangon Weber, 1795, are hereby suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology: (a) Alpheus Fabricius, 1798 (masculine) (type species, by selection by Latreille (1810): Alpheus avarus Fabricius, 1798); (b) Crangon Fabricius, 1798 (feminine) (type species, by absolute tautonymy: Cancer crangon Linnaeus, 1758). (3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: (a) Alpheus Weber, 1795, and (b) Crangon Weber, 1795, (both as suppressed under (1) above), (c) Crago Lamarck, 1801 (an objective junior synonym of Crangon Fabricius, 1798). (4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology: (a) avarus Fabricius, 1798 (as published in the combination Alpheus avarus) (trivial name of type species of Alpheus Fabricius, 1798); (b) crangon Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination Cancer crangon) (trivial name of type species of Crangon Fabricius, 1798).

ALTERNATIVE ''B'' (Rejection of Dr. Holthuis' proposal)

(1) The application for the suppression under the plenary powers of Alpheus Weber, 1795, and of Crangon Weber, 1795, is hereby rejected. (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology: (a) Crangon Weber, 1795 (feminine) (type species, by monotypy: Astacus malabaricus Fabricius, 1775); (b) Crago Lamarck, 1800 (masculine) (type species, by monotypy: Cancer crangon Linnaeus, 1758). (3) The following names are hereby placed on the

(Continuation of Second Enclosure to Voting Paper V.P.(53)4)

(Continuation of Sheet No. 2)

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: (a) Alpheus Weber, 1795 (an objective junior synonym of Cancer Linnaeus, 1758, having the same species, Cancer pagurus Linnaeus, 1758, as its type species, that species having been so selected for Cancer Linnaeus by Latreille (1810) and for Alpheus Weber by Rathbun (1930)); (b) Alpheus Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of Alpheus Weber, 1795); (c) Crangon Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of Alpheus Weber, 1795); (c) Crangon Fabricius, 1798 (an objective junior homonym of Crangon Weber, 1795). (4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology: (a) crangon Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination Cancer crangon) (trivial name of type species of Crago Lamarck, 1800); (b) malabaricus Fabricius, 1775, (as published in the combination Astacus malabaricus) (trivial name of type species of Crangon Weber, 1795); (c) avarus Fabricius, 1798 (as published in the combination Alpheus avarus).

CASE NO. 65

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY : PROPOSED MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)64)

DOCUMENT 65/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 27th July, 1952, from
Mr. W. I. FOLLETT, Chairman

I enclose reports (in duplicate) on the remaining five nomenclatorial problems that were submitted to ballot of the entire membership of the Society of Systematic Zoology during Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of that society.

These reports * are entitled as follows :

. . . . . .

(3) " Interrelationship of International Congress and International Commission ".

. . . . . .

This material is transmitted to you for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or opinions are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revisions of the *Règles*.

* The other reports here referred to, which deal with different subjects, have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 65/1

Interrelationship of the International Commission and the International Congress

During Dr. Charles D. Michener's chairmanship of the nomenclature committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, the following ballot was distributed to the members of that society :

(1) I would prefer to have the Commission divorced from the Congress if a practical plan can be devised for operating the Commission in some other way.

(2) I approve the *status quo*, final authority for the Commission's actions resting with the Congress.

According to Dr. Michener's tabulation of the votes cast, the result was as follows :

(1) 124 (Commission divorced from Congress).

(2) 140 (Congress to retain final authority for Commission's actions).

In view of these returns, it is recommended that the International Congress of Zoology retain final authority for the actions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Dated, July 27, 1952.

W. I. FOLLETT,

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

CASE NO. 66

QUESTION OF THE SIZE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)60)

DOCUMENT 66/1

(1) **Letter, dated 24th July, 1952, from Dr. HENNING LEMCHE** (*Universitetets Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen*) **to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.**

There was a single question settled in Paris which at once I decided to place under discussion again at the next Congress. I hereby ask that it is made part of the Agenda. It is the question of the *Number of Commissioners*.

It is an old experience that the larger a Commission, the more difficult it is to handle. In the present case, our Secretary has such an iron-energy that he will be able to manage even a very large Commission, but there will come a time when—for the reason of age or other work—he can not continue. Then, we are to find another Secretary, and the larger the Commission, the more difficult will be the task he has to take over. So, we *must* prevent the Commission in growing too large. It will always be much more difficult to reduce the number than it is to increase it.

The Secretary's idea of representatives for all interested bodies—all its idealistic background unchallenged—cannot be carried through in practice. It is quite correct that the members of the Commission have to be chosen in such a way that they represent as many different aspects of zoology and as many different parts of the world as ever possible. This, however, cannot be done simply by increasing the number of Commissioners, but these are to be chosen freely among the best suited people available.

Also, I feel that every single reference to a Commissioner representing any nationality is dangerous. Then, all other nations could claim a right to be represented, and in addition to the mere increase in numbers referred to above, there will be a very real danger that the representatives would be chosen more for demonstrating a nation's proudness of existing than for the advancement of science. Also, the way has been opened for starting political implications. So, I want to propose that the number of Commissioners is again limited, say to 20.

(2) **Letter, dated 9th August, 1952, from FRANCIS HEMMING,** *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature,* **to Dr. HENNING LEMCHE** (*Copenhagen*).

Your proposal will be put down for consideration at Copenhagen in accordance with your request, along with another proposal on a different aspect of this question which I have received from a different source. Speaking personally, I disagree with your proposal, as I think you know, for it is, in my opinion, undemocratic and represents an outworn conception of the proper composition of international bodies.

(3) **Letter, dated 6th September, 1952, from Dr. HENNING LEMCHE to the Secretary to the International Commission.**

Your remark of Aug. 9th to my former letter on this question has convinced me that I am half way wrong in my view concerning the composition of the Commission. May be it will be possible to find a solution allowing us to avoid the danger which you correctly see in my former view, as well as the dangers I think we have introduced by our decisions in 1948.

DOCUMENT 66/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING,** C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In the correspondence reproduced in Document 66/1, Dr. Henning Lemche raises the question whether the present regulations regarding the size and composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are the best adapted for this purpose.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure, included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the topic raised by Dr. Lemche can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the present organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in the papers published as Documents 64/1, 67/1 and 68/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question raised by Dr. Lemche, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations governing the size and composition of the International Commission. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 4—10).

CASE NO. 67

QUALIFICATIONS TO BE LOOKED FOR IN CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION IN ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND METHOD TO BE ADOPTED FOR ELECTIONS TO THAT BODY

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)58)

DOCUMENT 67/1

By the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

. . . . . .

Proposal 5

We propose that definite standards of eligibility be adopted for nominees to vacant positions in the Commission. It should be stated clearly that no zoologist be eligible for election regardless of his nationality or place of residence unless he be a distinguished biologist. Lists of nominees should be published by the Commission at least three months before each Congress.

---

* The other proposals here referred to which deal with different subjects have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Reasons: The election of new Commissioners has been exceedingly haphazard in the past. Some zoologists were elected to the Commission for personal or political reasons, who were far inferior in their knowledge of the science of systematics and the principles of nomenclature to other available zoologists who were not elected. The process of this self-perpetuation of the Commission should be abolished.

KARL P. SCHMIDT

DR. FRITZ HAAS

LOREN P. WOODS

ROBERT F. INGER

A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)

EMMET R. BLAKE

RUPERT L. WENZEL

COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN

CLIFFORD H. POPE

D. DWIGHT DAVIS

DOCUMENT 67/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT REGULATIONS IN REGARD TO THE QUALIFICATIONS TO BE LOOKED FOR IN CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND THE METHOD TO BE ADOPTED FOR ELECTIONS TO THAT BODY

In the letter reproduced as Document 67/1 the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum raises the question of the qualifications to be looked for in candidates for election as members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the method to be adopted in making elections to that body.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the present organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in Documents 64/1, 66/1, and 68/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations relating to the qualifications of candidates for membership of the International Commission and the procedure to be followed in making elections to that body. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 11—16).

CASE NO. 68

PERIOD OF SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)59)

DOCUMENT 68/1

By the **COMMITTEE ON NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

Extract from a letter dated 15th May, 1952.

The Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum proposes modifications of and additions to the Rules of Zoological Nomenclature as below stated. These proposals * are submitted to the International Commission more than one year in advance of the International Zoological Congress at Copenhagen with the request that they be put to a vote at the Section of Nomenclature of said Congress.

. . . . . .

Proposal 4

We propose that the By-Laws of the Commission provide for a more efficient rotation of Commissioners (excepting the Secretary). There should be either a definite retirement age (let us say age 70) or a provision that a Commissioner is not eligible for re-election after three successive terms of five years each.

---

* The other proposals referred to here, which deal with different subjects, have been published at the appropriate parts in the present volume.

Reasons: In past years some Commissioners have stayed in office far beyond their period of usefulness. It is important for a body like the International Commission to have new blood at regular intervals. The regulated election of new Commissioners is important to spread the changes in the Commission evenly and to ensure that at any given time only a fixed small percentage of the Commissioners is new and inexperienced.

KARL P. SCHMIDT

DR. FRITZ HAAS

LOREN P. WOODS

ROBERT F. INGER

A. L. RAND (mostly reservations about the form of Proposal 3)

EMMET R. BLAKE

RUPERT L. WENZEL

COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN

CLIFFORD H. POPE

D. DWIGHT DAVIS

DOCUMENT 68/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE REGULATIONS AT PRESENT IN FORCE FOR SECURING THE DUE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR DUTIES BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In the letter reproduced as Document 68/1 the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum raises the question of the measures necessary to ensure the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

2. As explained in the paper regarding the present rules governing the size and composition of the International Commission, the election of its members and its procedure included in the present Series as Document 64/2, it is considered that the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum can best be considered in the first instance as part of the general question of the organisation of the International Commission, other aspects of which are raised in Documents 64/1, 66/1, and 67/1.

3. For the proper understanding of the question here raised by the Committee on Nomenclature of the Chicago Natural History Museum, some knowledge is required of the historical background of the present regulations for ensuring the due discharge of their duties by individual members of the International Commission. For this reason a brief account of this subject has been included in the general note on the organisation of the International Commission included in the present Series as Document 64/2 (see paragraphs 18–24).

CASE NO. 69

ON THE GIVING BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF ADVANCE NOTICE OF ACTION PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN PARTICULAR CASES

(Commission's reference Z.N.(G.)63)

DOCUMENT 69/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor Charles D. Michener, as Chairman of the above Committee, communicated by his successor, Mr. W. I. Follett, under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets * deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revision of the *Règles*.

---

* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 68/1

Advance Notice of Proposed Action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Numerous members of the Society of Systematic Zoology believe that a major cause of the differences of opinion which have arisen among taxonomists about nomenclatorial problems since the Paris (1948) meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature stems not so much from the decisions reached at that meeting, as from failure to notify taxonomists of the proposed decisions well in advance of the meeting and to give them an opportunity to comment on the proposals. To a slight extent the need for advance notice has been satisfied by failure to print promptly the *Règles* as modified at Paris. However, to determine the views of American taxonomists on this matter, the following ballot was distributed to members of the Society of Systematic Zoology.

(1) I would prefer to require that notice of all proposed rulings of the Commission be published in appropriate journals a year in advance of final action so that those interested can express their views.

(2) I approve of allowing the Commission, without prior notice, to pass on relatively minor points (e.g., *nomina conservanda* or other matters affecting problems only in a single genus or family) at a meeting but would require that notice of all major problems or changes in rules under consideration be published in appropriate journals a year in advance of final action so that those interested can express their views.

(3) I approve the *status quo* which at least in practice permits major changes in the rules to be proposed and passed at the same meeting.

The voting was as follows :

(1) 157 (advance notice on all decisions)

(2) 158 (advance notice on major issues)

(3) 6 (advance notice not required).

In view of this vote, it is requested that binding provisions (not subject to being set aside at any single meeting or at any two meetings occurring within a single 12 months period) be adopted making it impossible for the Commission to effect any change in the *Règles* without advance notice of six months or preferably a year in the usual journals.

CHARLES D. MICHENER

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 69/2

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

PROCEDURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE IN THE MATTER OF GIVING ADVANCE NOTICE OF ACTION PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN REGARD TO PARTICULAR PROBLEMS

In the enclosure to Document 69/1 particulars are given of a vote taken among the members of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the question of the giving of advance notice of matters on which action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is contemplated.

2. It is not stated in the foregoing document when the vote there described was taken among the members of the Society. It appears, however, that the taking of this vote was prompted by the fact that decisions were taken in Paris in 1948 in regard to various matters on which advance notice had not been given in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* or otherwise.

3. In this connection it should be noted that for the last four years no decision on any individual question has been taken by the International Commission until after the application relating to the subject concerned has been published in the *Bulletin* and an interval of six months has been allowed to pass, in order to provide interested zoologists with an opportunity, should they so desire, to submit comments upon the application concerned for consideration by the members of the International Commission when they come to vote upon the proposal in question. It is not proposed to bring forward at Copenhagen for decision any applications relating to individual names, cases relating to which will continue to be dealt with by the Commission by correspondence under the normal procedure described above.

4. As regards the questions relating to the text of the *Règles* to be considered at Copenhagen this year, it will be recalled that, as regards the seven major problems which were deferred by the Paris (1948) Congress for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953, a special volume (volume 7) of the *Bulletin* was published in 1952 in which also an appeal was made to all interested specialists for advice as to the action which it was, in their view, desirable should be taken. The comments received in regard to the foregoing problems, together with the entire documentation relating to the other applications received in regard to the text of the *Règles*, have since been published in volumes 8 and 10 of the *Bulletin*.

5. In addition, in order to provide the maximum opportunity for the discussion of the foregoing matters at Copenhagen, arrangements have been made by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (on behalf of the International Commission) for the holding in that city during the week preceding the opening of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology of a Colloquium at which it is proposed to examine each of the problems relating to the *Règles* which will be considered when the Congress meets. Invitations to the Colloquium were issued by the International Trust to the leading Museums and other scientific institutions concerned with zoology in different parts of the world and personally also to specialists known to be interested in general problems of nomenclature.

PART 4

PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CASE NO. 70

COPYRIGHT OF THE PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

(Trust's reference I.T.Z.N. 34)

DOCUMENT 70/1

By the **NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY OF SYSTEMATIC ZOOLOGY**

Letter, dated 19th June, 1952, from Professor Charles D. Michener, as Chairman of the above Committee, communicated by his successor, Mr. W. I. Follett, under cover of a letter dated 27th July, 1952.

The Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology has recently made a study of a number of nomenclatorial problems. In some instances it has sent a ballot to members of the Society in order that its opinion and recommendations to you would correctly reflect the viewpoint of American taxonomists.

The material on the enclosed sheets * deals with the results of such ballots. It is transmitted to you with the request that the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be notified of the stand of the Society on the problems concerned, and that, where rules or *Opinions* are involved, this stand be considered in connection with the proposed revision of the *Règles*.

* The other sheets enclosed by Professor Michener are published elsewhere in the present volume.

Enclosure to Document 70/1

COPYRIGHT OF INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE PUBLICATIONS

A survey of the attitude of American taxonomists toward the practice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of copyrighting its publications has been completed by the Nomenclature Committee of the SSZ. The results are reported below. The survey consisted of the following statement and ballot of four choices.

" Since 1943 the publications of the ICZN (Opinions and Declarations rendered by the ICZN and the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*) have borne the statement 'All Rights Reserved '.

" The secretary of the Commission has stated that this was done to protect the financial interest of the Commission in the excess stock of these publications.

" There are some who feel that this material is of public nature and should receive the widest possible dissemination. Although the copyright is not in force in the U.S. (as of April, 1950), and perhaps these publications could not be copyrighted here because of their public nature, the result is much the same because publishing companies feel obligated to respect copyrights of other countries. Therefore, because the secretary of the Commission did not authorize quotations, at least two important works designed for the training of students in taxonomy have had to paraphrase all references to ICZN opinions published since 1943.

(1) I favour the strict application of the copyright in order to safeguard the financial interests of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.

(2) I favour the copyright but believe that the Trust should publicly state its permission to make short quotations of portions of *Opinions*, etc., in connection with discussions of nomenclatorial matters in scientific papers.

(3) I favour the copyright to protect the Trust against unauthorized and unprofessional reprinting and believe that the Trust should publicly state that it permits quotations such as those indicated in 2 above, AND that, on application, any *bona fide* zoologist or zoological organization will be given permission to reproduce material such as rules, amendments, *Opinions*, or parts thereof in text or reference works on taxonomy, nomenclature, and related matter.

(4) I favour complete elimination of the copyright."

The voting on these choices was as follows:

(1) 1 (Strict application)

(2) 9 (Partial quotation permitted)

(3) 218 (Professional quotation permitted on application)

(4) 106 (Complete elimination of copyright).

In view of these returns, and also in view of the opinions of the individual members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, it is strongly urged and requested that the secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature publicly state, in print, the permission of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature to make short quotations of portions of *Opinions*, etc., in connection with the discussions of nomenclatorial matters in scientific papers.

It is equally strongly urged and requested that the secretary of the ICZN publicly state, in print, that, on application, any *bona fide* zoologist or zoological organization will be given permission to reproduce material such as rules, amendments, *Opinions*, or parts thereof in text or reference works on taxonomy, nomenclature, and related matter.

CHARLES D. MICHENER

Chairman, Nomenclature Committee
Society of Systematic Zoology.

DOCUMENT 70/2

COPYRIGHT OF PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

In view of requests for guidance received as to the extent to which, and the conditions in which, documents published by it may be quoted or reproduced in other publications, the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature has issued the following announcement.

Extent to which, and conditions in which, documents published by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature may be quoted or reproduced in other publications

(1) The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature has no objection to the publication, without prior permission having been obtained, of short extracts from books, serial publications or other matter published by it, where such quotations are required for the discussion of nomenclatorial matters in scientific books or papers.

(2) The International Trust is prepared also to give sympathetic consideration to applications submitted to it to publish more extended quotations from books, serial publications and other matter published by it. In such a case the applicant should give full particulars of the extracts which it is desired to publish and the reasons why it is desired to publish those quotations and, should give an assurance that, if permission is granted, (*a*) an acknowledgment of that permission will be included in the book or paper concerned in a form to be agreed with the International Trust, (*b*) payment, by way of royalty, will be made to the International Trust of such sum as may be agreed upon between the Trust and the applicant, and (*c*), as soon as possible after the publication of a book or paper which, by permission of the Trust, contains extended quotations from books or other matter published by it, a copy of the book or paper containing these quotations will be transmitted by the applicant to the Trust at its Registered Offices.

(3) The International Trust is dependent for by far the greater part of its income upon the revenue derived from the sale of its publications. It cannot, therefore, see its way to grant permission for the publication in full by other bodies of books, articles and other matter published by it, and in the circumstances it would not expect that a request of this kind would be submitted to it.

Offices of the International Trust
for Zoological Nomenclature,
41, Queen's Gate,
London, S.W.7.
8th June, 1953.

Printed in England by METCALFE & COOPER LIMITED, 10-24 Scrutton St., London E C 2